

### REMARKS

Applicants have herewith amended the generic claims to now recite "an absorbent consisting of." Thus, the claims are directed to the specific embodiment of absorption solutions described in paragraph [0037] of the application. The use of the transitional phrase "consisting of" excludes absorbents other than alkali metal hydroxides, alkaline earth metal hydroxides, or mixtures thereof; *see* M.P.E.P. § 2111.03. It is submitted that the amendment to the claim obviates the rejections of record as set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action to which this is responsive.

Claims 43-56, 73 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Verma et al. (WO 97/49842) in view of Chandler et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Verma et al. teaches the use of alkali metal halide absorbents, excluded from the absorbents recited in Applicants' claims. Thus, the combination of Verma et al. and Chandler et al. does not result in Applicants' compositions and the rejection cannot stand.

Claims 57-63 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Verma et al., Chandler et al. and further in view of Kojak et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The rejection is improper for the aforesaid reasons regarding the Verma et al. reference and will not be repeated for the sake of brevity.

Claims 57-60, 62 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Verma et al., Chandler et al. and Takahashi. The rejection is respectfully traversed, and is improper for the same reasons set forth above, which will not be repeated for the sake of brevity.

Claims 57-60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Verma et al., Chandler et al. and further in view of Yazaki Corp. The rejection is respectfully traversed, and is improper for the aforesaid reasons. Again, Verma et al. teaches absorbents which are not within the scope of Applicants' amended claims.

Claims 57-60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Verma et al. in view of Chandler et al. and further in view of Greeley et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed and is improper for the aforesaid reasons.

Claims 76 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Verma et al. in view of Greenley et al. and further in view of Cheng et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner states that Verma teaches absorption solutions comprising lithium

**Appl. No.** : **10/732,992**  
**Filed** : **December 11, 2003**

hydroxide referring to page 10, lines 30-35, of the reference. The Examiner is mistaken. The only reference to lithium hydroxide is for adjusting the pH, and not as an absorbent within the scope of Applicants' specification nor within the scope of the reference itself which requires alkali metal halide absorbents in amounts of between about 40 to about 65%, by weight; *see* page 10, lines 13-25. Such absorbents are not within the scope of Applicants' claims, and thus the rejection is improper and cannot stand.


In view of the language of Applicants' claims and for the reasons set forth hereinabove, it is submitted that the claims are patentable over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 12, 2007

By:   
Michael E. Fuller  
Registration No. 36,516  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

3982786/sld  
070907